DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 049 HE 003 179

AUTHOR Smith, Ted C.
TITLE Organizational Conduciveness of Universities as a Determinant of Student Unrest.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Portland, Oregon, April 13-15, 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Activism; *Educational Administration; *Higher Education; *Student Alienation; Student Attitudes; *Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper is an analysis of the vulnerability of college and university organizations to student unrest. The system's structural properties and their interrelationships determine the degree of structural conduciveness to norm-oriented movements or hostile outbursts. It was found that variables relevant to structural conduciveness are all highly interrelated aspects of structural differentiation. The environment of the university is unstable with what is described as "disturbed-reactive" and "turbulent fields" qualities. Strategies of cooperation and coalescence used to cope with the environment are subtle and complex. The organizational structure of the university is highly decentralized, with tendencies in the administrative sector toward hierarchalization that are countered by departmental and academic autonomy and a new student subculture. Important factors that generate strain in American colleges and universities are: looseness of fit between norms influencing the education process and democratic equalitarian humanitarian values; separation and remoteness of policymaking bodies from their constituent groups; the encounter of social cleavages on campuses and the existence of strongly felt but ambiguous authority structure. (Author/HS)

ED 065049

ORGANIZATIONAL CONDUCIVENESS OF UNIVERSITIES AS A DETERMINANT IN STUDENT UNREST

Ted C. Smith
University of Utah

and

Faye C. Huerta
University of Utah

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Paper read at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, Aprin 13-15, 1972, Portland Oregon.

HE 003179

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ORGANIZATIONAL CONDUCIVENESS OF UNIVERSITIES AS A DETERMINANT IN STUDENT UNREST

The focus of this paper is an analysis of the vulnerability of college and university organizations to student unrest. The system's structural properties and their interrelationships determine the degree of structural conduciveness to norm-oriented movements or hostile outbursts. Pressures conducive toward strain will be viewed as the results of interaction among the constituent groups within the university community and between the university and its environment. The analysis will attempt to incorporate assumptions of an open systems approach to account for the preponderance of change brought about by input. Organization theory should illuminate the basis for much of the internal stress. The implications of change and stress for the occurrence of felt strain are present as the variables of structural conduciveness as offered by Smelser (1966). The variables to be considered in this paper are components of structural differentiation. These variables are: a high degree of separation of norms and values, a separation of the policy-making body from its publics, a contiguousness of social cleavages, a hierarchy of responsibility, channels for expressing grievances; media for disseminating ideas; the perceived effectiveness of authority, and potential avenues for exercising demands.

Structural Differentiation

Structural differentiation constitutes a basic factor of social unrest as a necessary but not sufficient variable. A high degree of structural differentiation coincides markedly with an open system. An open system is characterized by a high rate of input from the environment, a high capacity

and accessibility to a quantity and variety of information, and flexible rules for organizing problem-solving trials of the system. Such conditions characterize very well the system of higher education.

Furthermore, these conditions, making boundary maintenance problematic for the university, are increased in their complexity when analyzed in conjunction with the university's environment. Early colleges were small, separate, and had few similarities in terms of standards, admissions, etc., with each other. Their environment was placid, immediate, and local; therefore, authority could be formal and simple. Demands and pressures in the latter half of the Nineteenth Century representing government, foundations, and other benefactors necessitated a more complex form of college administration. Advanced academic studies in Europe awakened a competitive awareness of the state of scholarship in the United States. Standardization and demands for quality by foundations furthered the basis of competition. New universities and colleges needed the leadership to head the drive for excellence and innovation. University presidents of that era exercised a great deal of influence, had much impact on their universities.

As statewide systems of education developed, bargaining began to replace much of the competition. Growth and expansion of university activities during the last two decades denotes an increase in their functions. Many small, rural denominational and teacher colleges closed because they did not have the resources to make these transitions. Others in order to survive merged with another college or university or were incorporated into a network or system of colleges and universities. University consortia

illustrate the coalescence strategy of coping with a fluid, turbulent field. "Multiversities" illustrate each subsystem develops a primary concern of coping with its particular environment. Hence, university presidents today are described as "mediator initiators" (Kerr, 1963).

The following aspects of structural differential illustrate further the high degree of openness of college and university organization structures.

Separation of norms and values. The differentiation of norms from values has implication for the total social structure of a given society. It is reflected in the plurality of institutions and their coexistence. This differentiation of norms and values, therefore, has implications for the types of collective episodes arising from social conflict. If the social basis for conflict of interest, e.g., position in economic or political order, are not separated from racial, religious, ethnic, or kinship groups, any grievance may become a conflict of values. When this fusion occurs, efforts to modify the social order are likely to become value-oriented movements, i.e., revolutions (Smelser, 1966).

The social structure of the United States is noted for its complexity. Its tradition has been one of growth and prosperity, that is, change. In order to tolerate--if not always maximize--expansion, a wide disjunction of norms and values is needed. The process of institutionalization and accommodation to the larger society demands a tolerance for this disjuncture. This pluralism is indicative of the equifinality of open social systems, e.g., an abstraction may be interpreted behaviorally in a multitude of ways, numerous means can be employed to obtain the same goal, and the variety

of problem solving attempts is a function mainly of the information and flexibility of the system. The fact that the United States has experienced more norm-oriented movements than revolutionary movements in recent times is attributed by Smelser to this high level of differentiation of norms and values.

In looking over the history of higher education, this act of separating norms from values can account for the fact its contrasting features have produced little conflict. Historically, higher education has been placed in the precarious position of being separated from the National Government in terms of policy formation but used as a handmaiden by the Government for its practical concerns. Also historically the foundation of higher education was laid and developed by sectarian interest in spite of the dilemma of sacredness and tradition versus the task of open inquiry. Under the umbrella provided by the value of education, a wide diversity of colleges and universities developed. This diversity represents interest in pure scholarship, specialization for practical purposes, and professional training.

Public separated from policy making bodies. A social structure that separates its policy making body from the concerned public permits the more limited kinds of demands that arise when norms are separated from values. A structure which separates those groups in which the grievances are felt and made explicit from the groups in which these grievances are combined, weighed, and forged into policy helps to keep the grievances specific and segmented; and, thereby, they do not excite such a wide range of conflicts. The development of the political structure in Northwestern Europe and the

United States depicts the basic beliefs in the separateness of society's institutional sectors (Smelser, 1966). Privatism and specificity is further reinforced at the organizational and individual level by the same pattern of separation of public from policy making bodies. This function is performed at the top level where broad institutional policies are formed.

In terms of these two phases of the political process, two important considerations are: (a) How aware and how much information do the policy makers have about their publics? (b) How closely do the defined interests of the publics coincide with the interest of the policy makers? Relative to the first level of analysis, between the institutional sector and the larger political structure, the National Government has on the whole maintained a 'hands off' attitude toward the problems experienced by colleges and universities. The in loco parentis status accorded to universities allowed them discretionary powers over students. The 'separation of school and state' policy permitted the government not to get involved in a responsible manner for the problems of standards, growth, and funding faced by colleges and universities.

Higher education as a system is very loosely organized; and, therefore, it does not have a strong lobby. The proliferation of national associations within the education system and the number of Federal agencies independently involved in higher education make it impossible to recognize a voice that can speak for all. "When the Congress addresses itself to a nationwide concern in higher education, it sometimes hears a babel rather than a chorus of voices speaking from the academic sector" (Wilson, 1965, p. 36). The

relationship desired between the institution of higher education and the national government is currently being debated (Wilson, 1965). Circumstances make it clear that important decisions are increasingly being made at the national level. Although the need seems real and urgent for a more centralized agency to handle the programs of higher education, educators hesitate to form this consolidation. One reason for this reluctance appears to be a lack of confidence in the U.S. Office of Education which presumably would be the logical agency (Babbidge & Rosenzweig, 1962; Thackrey, 1965).

With respect to the second level of analysis of policy makers and their publics, the trustees or some equivalent body represents the policy making group in most colleges and universities. Their constituents are taxpayers, legislators, contributors, alumni, administrators, faculty, and students. These groups present a wide diversity of interests and demands which result in cross pressures. In most university organizations the trustees are much closer to their financial supporters than they are to the staff and clients of the organization. Particularly, the gulf between the backgrounds, attitudes, and beliefs of trustees and student activists is a large one (Foster, 1970). The fact points to the serious attention that should be directed to the considerations offered at the beginning of this section; How informed are the policy makers of their publics and how closely do their interests coincide?

Hierarchy of responsibility. The specificity which is inherent in the separation of norms and values, policy makers from their publics,

also characterizes a structure containing a hierarchy of responsibility. Rationality is a basic element of organizational structures; that is, there is some implicit or explicit reckoning between mean and ends. This reckoning reflects a different belief system or value orientation than that incorporating fatalism or infallibility. Therefore, personal responsibility and accountability in behalf of one's office is associated with organization functioning. Responsibility structure involves or is constructed in order to maintain continuity, efficiency, and effectiveness. In short, it maintains order. The degree of formality and explicitness of administrative responsibility is a useful baseline for describing a given organization.

Some social psychological effects of autocratic and bureaucratic structures are a withdrawal or denial of the personal and political factors in decision-making and a depersonalization of staff and clients (Katz and Kahn, 1967; Lunsfor, 1968; Scott & El-Assal, 1969). The results of such depersonalization--from indifference to revolt--for the organization might be anticipated by examining the larger culture context and the expectations of the people concerned (Crozier, 1964).

In addition, Smelser suggests that the growth of hostile outbursts and use of scapegoats are closely associated with diffused responsibility.

> The structure of responsibility in a situation of strain and the growth of hostile outbursts are closely associated. The association can be seen clearly when the definition of responsibility is diffuse--e.g., in high executive positions, in business, government, and the military. Under conditions of strain, those perceived to be responsible are expected to take remedial steps.

> In certain respects such outbursts of hostility are unrealistic because they oversimplify the causes of unsatisfactory states of affairs. On the other hand, we should not dismiss scapegoating of responsible figures simply as 'relatively sudden and uncontrolled outbursts of hostility.' They are the culmination of a build-up of a belief figure or agency (p. 228).

Universities are somewhat unique in that their organization structure is highly decentralized with different subsystems trying for power. This competition is indicative of growth by larger amounts of input from the environment. But such competition creates internal turbulence. The university is then characterized not only by a diffusion of power but an uncertainty of authority. Because of the diffusion and ambiguity of power, it is almost unavoidable that a scapegoat would be demanded in times of trouble or when efforts seeking normative change via legitimate means fail. The person most suited for this role is the university's president. The vulnerability of the president, if he should fail in his role as mediator, is well documented.

Some writers on organization argue that a horizontal distribution of responsibility and power fits the needs of modern organizations more than the traditional pyramid structure. They maintain that modern organizations are composed of subsystems staffed by specialists who maintain authority and power based on their specialized knowledge and skills. Therefore, they do not fit into the traditional hierarchal authority structure. They point out that the university is a case in point but that it is not as innovative in this respect as some business enterprises (Katz and Kahn, 1967; Newcomb, 1969).

Kerr (1966) and Wallis (1966) note that the pressures toward centralization come mainly from outside the university. The rapid rate of growth and extension of university activities into business, industry, and government necessitate the centralization of authority. Meanwhile, traditional internal processes and the project approach of allocating research funds work to maintain a decentralization of authority.

However, Kerr and Wallis differ in their perceptions of the effect of these two forces and in their suggestions for coping with them. Wallis suggests resolving the conflict between these two forces by having the university community refrain from participating in all those activities which are extraneous to the basic purpose of the university.

> Superimposed on the traditional university are many socially important functions which have burgeoned recently and could not have been provided for satisfactorily had not universities assumed responsibility for them. Organizational arrangement required to meet these responsibilities involve more concentration of authority within the university, and more delegation of authority to outsiders, that is compatible with the central, unique, and enduring purpose of a university. Other institutions now exist which are capable of handling most, perhaps all, of these responsibilities. That an activity is worth doing and involves scientists and science, or scholars and scholarship, is not sufficient ground for concluding that the activity is not a menace to the university which accommodates it. Universities should, therefore, retain such responsibilities, or accept new ones, only if they are compatible with the decentralized decision-making that is essential to the basic purpose of universities, or if they contribute substantially to activities that are essential to these basic purposes (p. 49).

Kerr, on the other hand, seems to believe that these two competing forces will prompt universities to maximize their potential. Consortia

and research centers representing academic "Plateaus" will conduct the continuing scientific transactions with other sectors of society. Undergraduate education will be improved; and university organization will be decentralized below the campus level to the operating agencies thereby making the collective facility a more vital, dynamic, progressive force.

> This new phase can carry the American commitment to education to new heights of endeavor. It also preserves the traditional freedom of higher education from excessive control. It can enlarge the horizons of equality of opportunity. It can maintain and even increase the margin of excellence. The challenge is to make certain it does all of these things (p. 35). Out of the pride of the old and the vacuum of the new may come the means to make undergraduate life more exciting, intellectual discourse more meaningful, administration more human (p. 38).

It becomes apparent from these two points of view that the direction consciously pursued by universities will depend upon the definition of purpose they assign themselves. More elusive, however, is ascertaining who is or should be influencing that decision and by what means.

Relative to the increasing strength of the administration, it might be assumed that faculty and student have an insignificant and impotent voice in determining the purpose, goals, and output of the university--faculty because they are fractionated and students because they have little formal powers.

This suggests a generalization that lends insight into some of the internal dynamics. In the administrative sector of the university, attitudes toward membership and behaviors reflecting this reveal a remunerative power basis. Behavior is strongly pragmatic and utilitarian; e.g., it

is businesslike. In the academic sector the attitudes toward membership and accompanying behaviors generally reflect a normative power base. It is these two differing orientations that provide different directions for faculty to take. Being caught between these two orientations creates uncertainty and ambivalence for many faculty members. Remunerative powers offer "systemic" rewards as opposed to "personal" rewards provided by normative power (Duster, 1968). "Publish or perish" is the dictum which illustrates the relative strengths of those two reward systems.

As inputs into higher levels of university management changed the basis of membership for administration and faculty, so has inputs at the lower level affected the basis of student membership. These changes coincide with the changes in student culture. A student culture reflecting students who are less compliant, less passive, and less receptive indicates a weakening of the traditional normative powers. With respect to these changes, most universities and some colleges are reviewing and reducing the in loco parentis role, but few are willing to abandon it altogether (Crazier, 1970).

Students are also demanding more voice in the management of university affairs--a change which they hope will replace the usual "sandbox" operation. Removed from the experiences of the average student, student government has generally been an arm of the administration to maintain order among the students. The successful cooperation of the leadership element has caused most students to view student government with either apathy or cynicism (Meyerson, 1966; Shaffer, 1970). In the past decade the disregard

it deserved is indicated by its lack of appearance on most university charts (Newcomb, 1969). Shaffer (1970) illustrates its insignificance by pointing out that John J. Corson's Governance of Colleges and Universities, published in 1960, generally considered to be one of the best on its subject, does not discuss student government in any way; it does not have the word "student" listed in its index. Shaffer and McGrath see a process of reformation in student governing indicating that the concept of student participation in policy making is gaining wide acceptance.

> The facts clearly indicate, however, that institutional progress in academic reconstruction is quite uneven. At one end of the scale are some institutions which have added an influential number of students to all major committees and have given them the full complement of parliamentary privileges enjoyed by faculty members, administrative officers, and trustees. But the institutions in this category constitute a negligible percentage of the whole. The majority have added only a few students, often only one or two, to some committees and frequently have given them merely the status of disputants, pleaders, or observers. At the other end of the scale are a few institutions in which students have yet to gain any formal role in academic, deliberative or legislative bodies. Neither experience nor informed public opinion has yet established in which bodies students should have membership, what proportion of the total they should be, or how they should be selected. There is, however, a growing volume of opinion that students should have the right to be involved in all the agencies which determine major institutional policies, and in particular that they should be admitted to committees which fix the purposes of the institution, design the educational program for their achievement, and organize and control other activities which shape the general character of the academic community. Moreover, to be effective and to assure their constituents that they speak for the whole student body, these representatives ought to be chosen by their own associates (McGrath, 1970, pp. 103-104).

Communication of grievances. Associated with a structure of responsibility is the existence of communication channels. The likelihood of a hostile outburst occurring depends to a large degree on the effective use of such channels. In determining the choice of hostility as a response to disturbing conditions, it is important to inquire into the possibility of expressing grievances by means other than hostility. Smelser suggests that in various contexts hostile outbursts appear as a result of the gradual or sudden closing of important and legitimate channels of protest. As long as protests can be effectively expressed by using legitimate channels there will be fewer recourses to hostile outbursts. Miles draws the following inference from his studies of institutional crises:

> Under conditions of low or declining morale in a large organization, a very small number of intensely alienated individuals may jeopardize its fundamental stability.
>
> The stability of institutions depends, in major degree, upon good communication between the authority structure and those affected by authority, and upon a feedback system which will give to top management a continuous reading on the psychological health of the organization (p. 361).

Using the assumption that (a) the predominant flow of information is downward, and (b) negative information is more selectively screened out than positive information, then one is led to conclude that even the best of organizations will have problems handling grievances. In universities where official and sympathetic offices exist, there appears to be low probability that the aggrieved person utilized the services of such offices because of the loose and little understood organization of the university.

Students inasmuch as they least understand the structure of the university and often feel alienated from it may feel very frustrated in their desires to express themselves. Vocation oriented and commuting students often have little contact with supportive others. Absence of a sympathetic ear or redress of a wrong often causes them to withdraw even more. Estrangement is certainly not the only and may not even the main reason for two thirds of our college students dropping out (Axelrod, et al, 1969); but undoubtedly it is an important contributing factor.

Another deterrent to the expression of grievances is the fear of retaliation. As long as a student's enrollment in college is forced upon him by general social pressures or parental demands, and as long as his presence there is considered by trustees, administration, and faculty to be more of a privilege than a right (Duster, 1968), then the length and viability of his presence there will be quite problematic. Thus, many students psychologically withdraw, become apathetic or 'invisible.' Others respond by performing know desired roles. These Keniston (1966) labels "professionalists"; Gordon (1966) identifies them as "model-followers." Students having most at stake, such as graduate students, students needing high G.P.A.'s, male students on draft deferment, etc., know and appreciate the benefits of developing a favorable impression; they are well aware of the danger of crossing some faculty member. A quote from Meyerson (1966) illustrates the constraints placed on students and the status afforded them.

> . . . they sense more keenly than they did in high school that students do not have inalienable rights, or, indeed, many rights at all.

> There is little in the formal life of the institution that the student can control, question publicly, or about which he can seek redress. Whether the teacher shocks him, or ignores him, or bores him, or awakes him to new vistas, or patronizes him, or argues with him, or is friendly to him, the student is dependent on the teacher's mood and interest. He is also bound by the actions of the administrators. Much of the student's extracurricular life--for example, the conduct of student residence or student activities--is controlled by the institutional administration (p. 272).

Social cleavages. When considering the impact of the factor of student population on structural conduciveness, the observer is immediately impressed by the sheer numbers and heterogeneity of this population. Either massive size or heterogeneity alone creates difficult management problems. Together the effect is compounded. The vast increase in college enrollments has come from non-white and lower socio-economic classes. This flux of students represents more directly a population change than a value change. The affluence of the working classes; the public pressures to attend college; recruitment and selective efforts of colleges; government aids, scholarships, increased part-time work opportunities, etc., propelled new groups to our colleges. All these groups brought new value constellations with them. This reflects the pluralism in America and consequent pluralism affecting our universities (Brown, 1967).

Further analysis leads one to appreciate the importance of these two factors, size and heterogeneity, in activating the intensity of social cleavages. Whatever their origin, cleavages are taken as a structurally conducive starting point for the analysis of collective outbursts of hostility (Smelser, 1966). In connection with the conduciveness of cleavages to

hostility, it is important to note the degree to which such cleavages coincide in society--how the factors differentiating the various cleavages are generalized or repeated in the different institutional sectors--how the economic, political, and racial-ethnic memberships coincide.

> When many cleavages coincide, moreover, a greater variety of specific situations of strain--economic, political, etc.--can open bases for general and often explosive, conflict. If, on the other hand, the various lines of cleavage crisscross, it is relatively easy to manage specific grievances peacefully (Smelser, p. 230). [Author's italics].

This observation indicates that such factors as race and sex which underwrite much of one's life changes, e.g. ascribe status and limit roles, result more often in hostile outbursts or value-oriented movements than norm-oriented movements when they become set in motion by the other determinants of collective behavior. To the degree that the basis of social cleavages coincide in society there is less segmentation of norms and values.

Hindsight, usually more astute and perceptive than foresight, leads to the realization that the realm of higher education is a potential arena for an encounter of social cleavages. The education context offers an optimum setting for increasing social awareness and arousing social indignation. It provides a setting for the articulation and expression of society's socio-legal discrepancies and inequities. This it does for an audience whose idealism has not been tempted by compromise.

In addition to the racial and socio-economic cleavages represented on campus is the very important status difference between age groups.

Inasmuch as the antagonism between youth and older generations has seemed to exist forever, why is it a critical factor now? Several suggestions are offered for the most overt hostile and disdainful behaviors shown by youth today: (a) Youth today are more physically independent in many ways than their previous counterparts, but, nevertheless, they seem to perceive few positive alternatives available to them. (b) The increased longevity of youth means a longer period of functionless engagement with society. (c) Half the population is under twenty-six years of age. (d) A strong youth culture has evolved and is enhanced in large part by mass communication and consumerism. (e) An erosion of traditional authority has occurred which to a large degree may be attributed to the rapid rate of social change. One might conclude from the foregoing that ambivalence, uncertainty, alienation are experienced by many young people. Flacks (1967) notes two sets of interrelated conditions under which students and young intellectuals seem to have become agents of opposition and change:

> When they have been marginal in the labor market because their numbers exceed the opportunities for employment commensurate with their abilities and training.
>
> When they found that the values with which they were closely connected by virtue of their upbringing no longer were appropriate to the developing social reality (p. 53).

Effectiveness of authority. Overlapping with the presence of channels for expressing grievances is the effectiveness of authority in preventing aggrieved persons from expressing hostility itself. What opportunities arise because persons or agencies in position of control are either unable

or unwilling to prevent hostile outbursts? Specifically, is there a recognized, legitimate agency or authority with a reputation for effective action? Are the mechanisms of maintaining social control archaic, ill-suited for the situation, or not mobile enough to rely upon? Are the penalties and sureness of their being enforced known before hand? (Smelser, 1966).

> It should be clear that lower participants will be more likely to circumvent higher authority, other factors remaining constant, when the mandates of those in power, if not the authority itself, are regarded as illegitimate . . . when lower participants become alienated from the organization. Coercive power is likely to be required if its formal mandates are to be fulfilled. To the extent that lower participants fail to recognize the legitimacy of power, or believe that sanctions cannot or will not be exercised when violations occur, the organization loses, to some extent, its ability to control their behavior (Mechanic, 1962-63, p. 355).

Campus authorities were unprepared for the different student input and subsequent subculture of the early Sixties. Whereas, student government was generally an effective mechanism for dealing with juvenile antics and individual acts of nonconformity, the coveted degree was the carrot in front of the vocationally oriented, examinations and grades were sufficient to control the professionals, and socialization insured conformity among most students, the administration was completely at a loss in how to deal with students intent on collective political action. The administration was constrained by several factors, i.e., its liberal, permissive ideology; its paternalism; and its diffused power.

Reliable, compliant behavior depends largely upon an adequate inducement-contribution balance; adequate pre-socialization to accept an inferior role-status; and limited access to relevant information, e.g., a lack of sophistication. Student input in the early Sixties brought in persons who were not prepared to assume the traditional student roles. They were not prepared psychologically for a hierarchal, bureaucratic university, and it was not prepared for them.

Communication among the dissident. If a norm-oriented movement is to develop, if its ideas are to be disseminated and action is to be mobilized, then it must have communication media. The access it has to public or mass media depends to a large extent upon the nature of political control and the extent to which public media can be manipulated or used for the dissident group's interest. Another aspect of communication among the dissention group is the extent to which they create their own culture--common language, literature, art, music, etc. What are the physical and social factors that enhance or hinder this development? What conditions affect efforts to mobilize and become organized?

The college or university campus where large numbers of students occupy a small amount of space provides ample opportunity for face to face encounters, milling, construction of interest groups, etc. The physical mobility of students, student newspapers, underground press, and intercollegiate activities serve very well as a beginning point for the dissemination of ideas. The mass media, especially TV, being eager

for the colorful news is easily used. The predilection of youth towards fads and jargon and their search for identity via such means encourage the development of a highly visible culture.

Potential avenues for exercising demands. One further condition may be given that is conducive to the development of a norm-oriented movement as opposed to sporadic hostile outbursts: the discontented must have some degree of access to some method of affecting the normative order. Using channels of democratic systems citizens influence authorities, who in turn are responsible for influencing the character of laws, regulations, and other kinds of norms. Under decentralized democratic systems citizens may apply action more directly by by-passing the authorities. Ubiquitous and varied social organizations provide such channels for action in achieving normative changes. "The potential availability of many different channels for affecting normative arrangements, plus the potential availability of many different kinds of organizations, presents a vast array of alternative strategies and tactics for any given movement" (Smelser, 1966, p. 282). Inasmuch as such potential avenues represent resources for the developing norm-oriented movement, its character and longevity depends on the selections it makes or fails to make.

The university offers a problematic source for obtaining allies. Trying to find allies among the enemy is no small feat in itself. And, like most organizations, the university does not welcome criticism, especially from its lower ranks. Moreso than other organizations it is reluctant to

make significant internal changes. Therefore, any support from within the university is likely to be on an individual basis. With respect to issues more removed from the university, the norm of keeping the university politically neutral limits the use of groupings or organizations within the university.

Other characteristics of the university, however, tend to encourage efforts to obtain alliance; an ideology subscribing to liberal tenets and a democratic--not an autocratic or elitist--concept of social control (Lunsford, 1968; Kerr, 1963); liberal professors who provide a reference "other" or "significant person" for the student (Keniston, 1967); a process of operations which is open, changing, and uncertain. Such ambiguities and normative policies of permissiveness encourage the formation of forces exercising old and/or new demands in novel ways.

> The new university, in its commitment to growth and its looseness of internal structure, creates an arena for crowd behavior and for the politics of semi-organized and organized interest groups. Feelings of powerlessness abound; salvation lies in organizing a blow. The move toward political action will come not only from the student minorities who dissent from the main drift and seek organized voices, especially the graduate students, but also from the fringe educational workers. The assistant professors and instructors, while restive, can usually see promise in the system; but as the ranks of nonfaculty swell, particularly the post-doctoral researchers and lecturers, discontent over second class citizenship will become an extensive and powerful phenomenon (Clark, 1968, p. 4).

Relevant to the availability of avenues for expressing discontent, Smelser finds that many norm-oriented movements crystalize when it appears

that one method of agitation has disappeared or is disappearing. When all avenues appear to be closed or closing, efforts revert to hostile outbursts.

Summary and Conclusions

Variables which are found to be relevant to structural conduciveness of colleges and universities to collective episodes, especially incipient norm-oriented movements and hostile outbursts, are all highly interrelated aspects of structural differentiation. The environment of the university is unstable with what is described as "disturbed-reactive" and "turbulent fields" qualities. Strategies of cooperation and coalescence used to cope with the environment are subtle and complex. The organizational structure of the university is highly decentralized with tendencies in the administrative sector toward hierarchalization which are countered by departmental and academic autonomy and a new student subculture. Important factors that generate strain in American colleges and universities are: looseness of fit between norms and influencing the education process and democratic equalitarian and humanitarian values; separation and remoteness of policy making bodies, the trustees, from their constituent groups, especially faculty and students; the encounter of social cleavages on campuses; the existence of strongly felt but ambiguous authority structure; unknown or suspected channels for expressing grievances.

Smelser's profile of structural conduciveness fits well in an open systems model wherein the two schemes are complementary to each other.

Working through an open systems model with an organization theoretical framework supplemented with information of higher education helps to identify some of the important variables, their characteristics, and interrelationship.

Efforts have been made in this paper to illustrate the cybernetic qualities of these variables. A study which recognizes sources and entry of inputs, their reception and treatment, and the meanings given to the various outputs is necessary to an understanding of organization functioning and its posture.

REFERENCES

Chapter V

Axelrod, J. et al. Search for Relevance: The Campus in Crisis. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Babbidge, H. D. & Rosenzweig, R. M. The Federal Interest in Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962.

Brown, D. R. "Student Stress and the Institutional Environment." Jrnl. of Social Issues, 1967, XXIII, (3), 92-107.

Cazier, S. "Student Power and In Loco Parentis." In J. Foster and D. Long (Eds.) Protest! Student Activism in America. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970. Pp. 506-530.

Clark, B. R. "The New University." American Behavioral Scientist, 1968, XI, (5), 1-4.

Crozier, M. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969.

Duster, T. "Student Interests, Student Power, and Student Experience." American Behavioral Scientist, 1968, XI, (5), 21-27.

Flacks, R. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest," Jrnl. of Social Issues, 1967, XXIII, (3), 52-75.

Foster, J. "The Trustees and Protest." In J. Foster & D. Long (Eds.) Protest! Student Activism in America. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970. Pp. 383-393.

Gordon, D. M. "'Rebellion" in Context: A Student's View of Students." In R. S. Morison (Ed.) The Contemporary University: U. S. A.. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 292-314.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. L. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Keniston, K. "The Faces in the Lecture Room." In R. S. Morison (Ed.) The Contemporary University: U. S. A.. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 315-349.

Keniston, K. "The Sources of Student Dissent," Jrnl. of Social Issues, 1967, XXIII, (3), 108-137.

Kerr, C. "The Frantic Race to Remain Contemporary." In R. S. Morison (Ed.) The Contemporary University: U. S. A.. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 19-38.

Lunsford, T. F. "Authority and Ideology in the Administered University," American Behavioral Scientist, 1968, XI, (5), 5-14.

McGrath, E. J. Should Students Share the Power? Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.

Mechanic, D. "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1962-63, 7, 349-364.

Meyerson, M. "The Ethics of the American College Student Beyond the Protest." In R. S. Morison (Ed.) The Contemporary University: U. S. A.. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 266-291.

Miles, R. E. "Pathology of Institutional Breakdown," Journal of Higher Education, 1969, 40, 351-368.

Newcomb, T. "University, Heal Thyself," Political Science Quarterly, 1968, 26, 299-306.

Pervin, L. A. et al. "The Dropout in Conflict With Society." In L. B. Mayhew (Ed.) Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Berkeley: McCutchan Pub. Co., 1967.

Scott, J. W. & El-Assil, M. "Multiversity, University Size, University Quality and Student Protest: An Empirical Study," (Biblio.), American Sociological Review, 1969, 34, 702-709.

Shaffer, R. H. "Student Government: Sandbox or Soapbox?" In J. Foster & D. Long (Eds.) Protest! Student Activism in America. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1970. Pp. 497-505.

Smelser, J. N. Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Thackrey, R. "National Organization in Higher Education." In L. Wilson (Ed.) Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965. Pp. 236-249.

Wallis, W. A. "Centripetal and Centrifugal Forces in University Organization." In R. S. Morison (Ed.) The Contemporary University: U. S. A.. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966. Pp. 39-50.

Wilson, L. Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Wilson, L. "Form and Function in American Higher Education." In L. Wilson (Ed.) Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1965.